

Appl. No. 10/807,925
Filed: March 24, 2004
Response dated April 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed February 16, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14 were pending in this application. Claims 1-12 and 14 have been rejected. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 14 have been amended. Claim 19 was added. Therefore, Claims 1-12, 14, and 19 are pending in the Application. Reconsideration of the application based on the remaining claims as amended and arguments submitted below is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 was objected to due to informalities. Claim 6 was amended as suggested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-12 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor (2,075,372). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

In regard to Claim 1, amended Claim 1 includes, among other features, first and second end separated by a middle portion, the first end being joined proximal the throat and the second end being joined proximal the side wall, wherein the middle portion is not attached to the sidewall between the first second ends. Taylor

Appl. No. 10/807,925
Filed: March 24, 2004
Response dated April 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed February 16, 2006

does not disclose these features. Taylor includes multiple attachments, at 10 and 6, of the “ribs” 5 between the “throat” 9 and the “sidewalls” 7.

In regard to Claims 2-5, Claims 2-5 are dependent back to patentability distinct Claim 1 and includes features not disclosed in the prior art. For example, Claim 5 include each floating ribs having an apex wherein the distance between the inner portions of the middle portions is greater than the distance between the inner edges of the sidewalls at the apexes. As such, Claims 2-5 are patentable.

In regard to Claim 6, amended Claim 6 includes, among other features, first and second ends separated by a middle portion, the first and second ends being joined to the lacrosse head, wherein the middle portion is unattached to the lacrosse head between the first and second ends. Taylor does not disclose these features. As previously discussed, Taylor includes multiple attachments of the “ribs” (indicia 4/5) between the ends of the “ribs”.

In regard to Claims 7-9, Claims 7-9 are dependent back to patentability distinct Claim 6 and include features not disclosed in the prior art. For example, Claim 7 teaches the floating rib being positioned substantially parallel to one of the side walls. As such, Claims 7-9 are patentable.

In regard to Claim 10, amended Claim 10 includes, among other features, floating ribs including a middle portion having an inner portion and an apex,

Appl. No. 10/807,925
Filed: March 24, 2004
Response dated April 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed February 16, 2006

wherein the distance between the inner portions of the floating ribs is greater than the distance between the inner edges of the sidewalls at the apex. Taylor does not disclose these features. In Taylor, the distance between the apexes of each side of the loop 4 proximate indicia 5 is not greater than the distance between the third loop 7.

In regard to Claims 11, 12, and 14, Claims 11, 12, and 14 are dependent back to patentability distinct Claim 10 and include features not disclosed in the prior art. As such, Claims 11, 12, and 14 are patentable.

New Claim

Claim 19 has been added and depends from claim 4. No new matter has been added.

Applicant has commented on some of the distinctions between the cited references and the claims to facilitate a better understanding of the present invention. This discussion is not exhaustive of the facets of the invention, and Applicant hereby reserves the right to present additional distinctions as appropriate. Furthermore, while these remarks may employ shortened, more specific, or variant descriptions of some of the claim language, Applicant

Appl. No. 10/807,925
Filed: March 24, 2004
Response dated April 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed February 16, 2006

respectfully notes that these remarks are not to be used to create implied limitations in the claims and only the actual wording of the claims should be considered against these references

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with the filing of this Amendment and Response to Deposit Account 23-0035.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/ Phil Walker/_____
Phillip E. Walker
Registration No. 52,336
WADDEY & PATTERSON
A Professional Corporation
Customer No. 23456

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Phillip E. Walker
Waddey & Patterson
1600 Division Street, Suite 500
Roundabout Plaza
Nashville, TN 37203
(615) 242-2400

Appl. No. 10/807,925
Filed: March 24, 2004
Response dated April 12, 2006
Reply to Office Action mailed February 16, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this Response and Amendment for Application No. 10/807,925 and filed March 24, 2004 is being transmitted electronically to:

Mail Stop RCE

Commissioner for Patents

Art Unit: 3711

Examiner: Michael S. Chambers

on April 12, 2006.

Phillip E. Walker

_____/ Phil Walker/_____
Registration No. 52,336